

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

NAHIM JORGE BONILLA,

Defendant.

No. CR 24-00369(A)-SPG-8

ORDER CONTINUING TRIAL DATE AND
FINDINGS REGARDING EXCLUDABLE
TIME PERIODS PURSUANT TO SPEEDY
TRIAL ACT

NEW TRIAL DATE: [05-06-25]

PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE: [04-30-25]

Having heard from plaintiff, the United States of America, by and through its counsel of record, Assistant United States Attorneys Lyndsi Allsop and Maria Jhai, and defendant, NAHIM JORGE BONILLA ("defendant"), both individually and by and through his counsel of record, Alan Eisner, at a status conference held before this Court on November 20, 2024, and good cause appearing, the Court hereby FINDS AS FOLLOWS:

1. The First Superseding Indictment in this case was filed on September 17, 2024, and made public on October 16, 2024. (Dkt. No. 10.) Defendant first appeared before a judicial officer of the court in which the charges in this case were pending on November 7, 2024. (Dkt. 93.) The Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161,

1 originally required that the trial commence on or before January 16,
2 2025.

3 2. On November 7, 2024, the Court set a trial date of January
4 7, 2025, and a status conference date of November 20, 2024.

5 3. The First Superseding Indictment also charges 15 other
6 individuals. On November 12, 2024, the Court set a trial date of
7 May 6, 2025, and a status conference date of April 30, 2025, as to
8 defendants Anthony Mendoza Lopez, Juan Manuel Quiroz Jimenez, and
9 Joel Sosa Cardenas. (Dkt. 98.) The remaining twelve defendants
10 have not yet appeared before a judicial officer of the court in
11 which the charges in this case are pending.

12 4. Defendant is detained pending trial. The parties estimate
13 that the trial in this matter will last approximately two to three
14 weeks. All defendants are joined for trial and a severance has not
15 been granted.

16 5. Defendant is charged with conspiracy to distribute and
17 possess with intent to distribute cocaine, in violation of 21 U.S.C.
18 § 846 (Count 2). Discovery in this case is voluminous. The
19 government has requested that the defense provide a flash drive for
20 the government's initial production, which will include more than 20
21 gigabytes of data, including written reports, photographs, telephone
22 records, and multiple audio recordings. The government will produce
23 additional discovery, including numerous video files, following
24 entry of a protective order.

25 6. On November 20, 2024, this Court held a status conference
26 in this case. Defendant appeared in person with his counsel of
27 record. Upon the request of defendant through counsel, the Court
28 continued the trial date from January 7, 2025 to May 6, 2025. This

1 Order supplements that findings and orders made by the Court at that
2 conference.

3 7. Due to the transnational nature of the prosecution and the
4 number of defendants, including the charges in the First Superseding
5 Indictment and the voluminous discovery being prepared for the
6 defense, this case is so unusual and so complex that it is
7 unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings
8 or for the trial itself within the Speedy Trial Act time limits.

9 8. In light of the foregoing, counsel for defendant needs
10 additional time to confer with defendant, conduct and complete an
11 independent investigation of the case, conduct and complete
12 additional legal research including for potential pre-trial motions,
13 review the discovery and potential evidence in the case, and prepare
14 for trial in the event that a pretrial resolution does not occur.

15 9. Defendant's counsel has conferred with defendant regarding
16 defendant's rights under the Speedy Trial Act. In addition, the
17 Court inquired of defendant in open court regarding his Speedy Trial
18 Act rights. Defendant stated that he understands his rights under
19 the Speedy Trial Act and that he knowingly and voluntarily waives
20 those rights and agrees to the trial schedule included in this
21 Order. Defendant further believes that failure to grant the
22 continuance will deny him continuity of counsel and adequate
23 representation.

24 10. The government does not object to the continuance.

25 11. The continuance is not based on congestion of the Court's
26 calendar, lack of diligent preparation on the part of the attorney
27 for the government or the defense, or failure on the part of the
28 attorney for the Government to obtain available witnesses.

1 12. The ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the
2 best interest of the public and defendant in a speedy trial.

3 13. Failure to grant the continuance would be likely to make a
4 continuation of the proceeding impossible, or result in a
5 miscarriage of justice.

6 14. The case is so unusual and so complex, due to the nature
7 of the prosecution and the number of defendants, that it is
8 unreasonable to expect preparation for pre-trial proceedings or for
9 the trial itself within the time limits established by the Speedy
10 Trial Act.

11 15. Failure to grant the continuance would unreasonably deny
12 defendant continuity of counsel and would deny defense counsel the
13 reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into
14 account the exercise of due diligence.

15 Accordingly, the Court finds that there are facts that support
16 a continuance of the trial date in this matter, and good cause for a
17 finding of excludable time pursuant to the Speedy Trial Act, 18
18 U.S.C. § 3161.

19 THEREFORE, FOR GOOD CAUSE SHOWN:

20 1. The trial in this matter is continued from January 7, 2025
21 to May 6, 2025. The status conference hearing is continued to April
22 30, 2025.

23 2. The time period of November 20, 2024 to May 6, 2025,
24 inclusive, is excluded in computing the time within which the trial
25 must commence, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A), (h)(7)(B)(i),
26 (B)(ii), and (B)(iv), and (h)(6).

27 3. Nothing in this Order shall preclude a finding that other
28 provisions of the Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time

1 periods are excluded from the period within which trial must
2 commence. Moreover, the same provisions and/or other provisions of
3 the Speedy Trial Act may in the future authorize the exclusion of
4 additional time periods from the period within which trial must
5 commence.

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7
8 November 22, 2024

9 DATE



HONORABLE SHERILYN PEACE GARNETT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

10 Presented by:

11 /s/

MARIA JHAI

12 Assistant United States Attorney
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28